



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/450,261	11/29/1999	RANDY P. STANLEY	INTL-0289-US	7389

7590 01/06/2004

TIMOTHY N TROP  
TROP PRUNER HU & MILES PC  
8554 KATY FREEWAY  
SUITE 100  
HOUSTON, TX 77024

EXAMINER
----------

LIN, KENNY S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 01/06/2004

17

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/450,261

Applicant(s)

STANLEY, RANDY P.

Examiner

Kenny Lin

Art Unit

2154

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 22 December 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: \_\_\_\_\_.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: none.Claim(s) objected to: none.Claim(s) rejected: 1-20.Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☒ Other: see attached sheet

JOHN FOLLANSBEE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

**Advisory Action**

1. Claims 1-20 are presented for examination.
2. Applicant's arguments filed 12/22/2003, regarding claims 1-20 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
3. In the remark, the applicant argued that (1) There is no teaching where Outlook 98 teaches that time sensitive data from one processor-based system to another processor-based system is first transferred and later displayed automatically. (2) Time sensitive data is not transferred from a processor-based system to a system on which Outlook 98 is install. Therefore, Outlook 98 reference cannot teach an automatic display of data because Outlook 98 is simply designed to operate on a single processor-based system on which the time sensitive data resides. (3) Outlook 98 reference does not teach interacting with another processor-based system from which the time sensitive data has to be automatically transferred to a processor-based system.
4. The request for reconsideration has been entered and considered but does not overcome the rejection because:  
  
As to points (1) and (3), automatically data transferring (title, col.3, lines 49-55, col.5, lines 6-9, col.9, lines 36-44) and processor-based system interaction (col.6, lines 55-67, col.7, lines 1-23) are taught in Narurkar. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA

Art Unit: 2154

1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Examiner's citation of Narurkar reference regarding these limitations should not be place in ignorance.

As to point (2), Outlook 98 reference taught the concept of using reminders that automatically displays at predetermined time. Such concept can be used with other PIM software and all processor-based system. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to realize that the need of Outlook 98 software is not needed. If this were an important issue, applicant should have pointed it out prior to the application made final.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenny Lin whose telephone number is (703)305-0438. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM to 5 PM Tuesday to Friday and every other Monday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (703)305-8498. Additionally, the fax numbers for Group 2100 are as follows:

Official Responses: (703) 872-9306

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-6121.

ksl  
December 30, 2003



JOHN FOLLANSBEE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100